Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 4 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

3

No. 89-383

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1989

LARRY RAY HANSON,
Petitioner,
vs.
PETER N. ARROWSMITH, M.D.; PETER N. ARROWSMITH, M.D., P.C.; AND ARROWSMITH EYE INSTITUTE,
Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STEVEN A. RILEY
(Counsel of Record)
BASS, BERRY & SIMS
2700 First American Center
Nashville, Tennessee 37238
615/742-6200
Attorneys for Petitioner

E. L. MENDENHALL, INC., 926 Cherry Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64106, (816) 421-3080

2 pp

(Filed September 9, 1986)

IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT
OF TENNESSEE,
NASHVILLE DIVISION

DOCKET NO. 3-84-0655

LARRY RAY HANSON, ET AL.,

vs.

PARKSIDE SURGERY CENTER, ET AL.

ORDER

Pending before the Court is plaintiffs' motion for a new trial. The Court, pursuant to Local Rule of Court 8(b)(1), finds that oral argument on this motion is unnecessary. In their motion, plaintiffs assert a number of grounds for a new trial.

First, plaintiffs assert that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence. However, plaintiffs have not demonstrated that the jury verdict was in any way contrary to the evidence. Accordingly, the motion for a new trial on this ground is hereby DENIED.

Second, plaintiffs have alleged that a new trial is warranted because the Court erred in thirteen respects in its conduct of the trial. Each of these claims is legal in nature, yet plaintiffs have provided to the Court no legal authority as required by Local Rule of Court 8(b)(2) in support thereof. Accordingly, the motion for a new trial on these grounds also is DENIED.

Entered this the 9th day of September, 1986.

/s/ John T. Nixon
United States District Judge